United Nations S/2001/1025

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Second report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of Security Council resolution 1343 (2001) regarding Liberia

I. Introduction

1. In paragraph 12 of its resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, the Security Council requested me to submit to it a first report by 30 April 2001 and to report thereafter at six-month intervals, drawing on information from all relevant sources, including the United Nations Office in Liberia, the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), on whether Liberia had complied with the demands in paragraph 2 of that resolution, and on any progress made towards the objectives set out in paragraph 3 of the resolution.

2. The present report is submitted pursuant to that request and contains information provided to the United Nations Office in Liberia by the Government of Liberia relative to paragraph 2 (a) to (e) of resolution 1343 (2001), as well as information provided by UNAMSIL on paragraph 3 (a) to (d). The report also contains some observations provided by ECOWAS.

II. Information provided by the United Nations Office in Liberia, UNAMSIL and ECOWAS regarding Liberia's compliance with resolution 1343 (2001)

A. Information from the United Nations Office in Liberia

3. The capacity of the United Nations Office in Liberia to provide independent confirmation of claims by the Government of Liberia regarding compliance with paragraph 2 of the resolution is severely handicapped. A number of documents were provided to the Office by the Government of Liberia as corroborating evidence of its compliance with the resolution. Those documents, a list of which is annexed to this report, are available in the Secretariat.

Paragraph 2 (a) of resolution 1343 (2001): expulsion of all RUF members from Liberia, and prohibition of all RUF activities on its territory

Paragraph 2 (b) of resolution 1343 (2001): cessation of all financial and military support to RUF, including all transfers of arms and ammunition, all military training and the provision of logistical and communications support, and taking steps to ensure that no such support is provided from the territory of Liberia or by its nationals

4. The Government of Liberia reports that it remains completely disengaged from the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), in accordance with its policy of disengagement. That policy, according to the Government, was adopted on 12 January 2001 because of misunderstanding about the Government's contacts with both RUF and other parties to the conflict in Sierra Leone. Those contacts had been open and were undertaken under a mandate from ECOWAS for the purpose of promoting regional peace and stability.

5. The border between Liberia and Sierra Leone has remained closed since March 2001. It is patrolled daily by security personnel. No material incidents have been reported by the Liberian patrol, apart from the arrest of the seven diamond smugglers mentioned in the previous report. Although the closure of the border was

01-60937 (E) 311001

not demanded in resolution 1343 (2001), it was nevertheless deemed appropriate, within the context of the policy of disengagement. It should be recalled that the Government of Liberia had requested both the United Nations and ECOWAS to patrol and monitor its closed border with Sierra Leone and to maintain a presence at all other ports of entry.

6. The Government of Liberia expresses the hope that, in the light of the above and in the absence of any evidence of its direct or indirect contact with RUF, it will be clear that it has severed all links with RUF.

7. The Government acknowledges the concern, expressed by the Secretary-General in his first report, at the untidy handling of the expulsion of RUF members, especially Sam Bockarie. It nevertheless has reiterated that Sam Bockarie is no longer in Liberia and has drawn attention to the following:

(a) The expulsion of Sam Bockarie was carried out in conformity with its policy of disengagement, which came into effect one month before the adoption of resolution 1343 (2001);

(b) The Government was not and is not under any obligation to show documentary evidence of departures related to the expulsion order concerning RUF. As adopted, resolution 1343 (2001) does not require the arrest or extradition of any member of RUF, nor does it impose a requirement for the expulsion of any RUF members to a particular country or a designated location. The Government notes also that it is not unusual in this region for daily border crossings to occur without immigration formalities.

8. The Government invites the Council to investigate rumours and unverified reports of Mr. Bockarie's continued presence in Liberia, and requests the assistance of Member States in ascertaining the possible presence of Sam Bockarie in their territories. The Government further states that it is willing to consider any additional measures to prove that it has severed its links with RUF.

Paragraph 2 (c): cessation of all direct or indirect import of Sierra Leone rough diamonds which are not controlled through the certificate of origin regime of the Government of Sierra Leone

9. The Government's ban on the importation of all uncertified rough diamonds from countries with certification regimes is still in force, and is being maintained. The ban on the exportation of Liberian diamonds also remains in full force in Liberia and worldwide, by virtue of a public notice served to all participants in the international diamond industry, including the High Diamond Council.

10. The ban on the importation of uncertified rough diamonds and the related ban on the exportation of Liberian diamonds are being vigorously enforced by customs personnel from the Ministry of Finance and security officers of the Ministry of Justice, who are stationed at every port of entry.

11. The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy has distributed to all diamond dealers in Liberia, and received acknowledgement thereof, official circulars concerning the ban on the exportation and importation of diamonds, and has established appropriate reporting requirements on continual dealings in diamonds.

12. The Government confirms that licensed dealers are continuing to deal in diamonds, but that all diamonds bought are stored in vaults that are subject to spot inspection by inspectors from the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy at any time determined by the said Ministry.

13. The Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy has drafted a certification regime in keeping with the demands of the United Nations, and on the basis of the Kimberley process, a centralized export process is being put into place, involving the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy, the Ministry of Finance and the Central Bank of Liberia. The ultimate objective of this system is to enhance transparency and legitimacy in the trade of diamonds in Liberia.

Paragraph 2 (d): freezing of funds or financial resources or assets that are made available by nationals of Liberia or within its territory directly or indirectly for the benefit of RUF or entities owned or controlled directly or indirectly by RUF

14. Since the submission of my first report (S/2001/424) on 30 April 2001, the Government of Liberia has provided the Secretariat with the following information:

(a) A court order has been obtained by the Government of Liberia to allow commercial banks operating in Liberia to disclose information to the Central Bank of Liberia on all financial assets and accounts that may be held by RUF or any of its

members named in annex 3 to the report of the Panel of Experts (S/2000/1195);

(b) The Central Bank of Liberia has requested all commercial banks operating in Liberia to provide detailed reports on any accounts or financial assets held by RUF members named in the court order, or individuals connected with them.

Paragraph 2 (e): grounding of all Liberia-registered aircraft operating within Liberia's jurisdiction until it updates its register of aircraft pursuant to annex VII to the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation of 1944 and provides to the Council the updated information concerning the registration and ownership of each aircraft registered in Liberia

15. The Government has de-registered and effectively closed the Liberian Air Registry. The Civil Aviation Authority of Liberia has begun the formulation and establishment of a new system of civil aircraft registration. The programme is based on the Gates system and is designed to ensure strict conformity with annex VII to the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation. A draft of the proposed registry has been completed, and will be reviewed by a team of International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) technicians who are due to visit Liberia shortly. While the Ministry of Transport is continuing to engage ICAO in partnership, the Government of Liberia reiterates its earlier appeal to the United Nations for assistance in this area.

16. Misunderstanding over Liberia's request to manage its airspace within the framework of the Roberts Flight Information Region has been resolved through consultations, at the technical level, during an informal coordinating meeting held at Dakar under the auspices of the ICAO Regional Office. A memorandum of understanding containing all the points of agreement and understanding has been drafted by the secretariat of the Roberts Flight Information Region and is soon to be signed.

B. Information from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone

Paragraph 3 (a): free access for UNAMSIL throughout Sierra Leone

17. In providing the information cited below, UNAMSIL stated that it did not have the capacity to monitor compliance with paragraph 2 of resolution 1343 (2001). It has, however, provided observations relating to the implementation of paragraph 3 of the resolution.

18. The Revolutionary United Front has allowed UNAMSIL free access throughout Sierra Leone. The deployment of UNAMSIL now covers a considerable part of the country, including Koinadugu in the north, Bo in the south and Kono in the east. The requisite preparations are under way to deploy the second Pakistani battalion in Kailahun by the end of October. With the arrival of the Nepalese battalion, which will be deployed in Moyamba in November, UNAMSIL will complete its deployment throughout the country.

19. Since the first tripartite meeting, on 15 May 2001, of the Government of Sierra Leone, UNAMSIL and RUF, all major decisions taken to move the peace process forward have largely been implemented by RUF, including allowing UNAMSIL free access throughout the country and to areas under RUF control. UNAMSIL has continued to carry out patrols throughout the country to investigate ceasefire violations and to carry out disarmament.

Paragraph 3 (b): release of all abducted civilians

20. Since the first tripartite meeting, RUF has continued to progressively release abducted persons, including child combatants. To date, a total of 1,169 children have been released to UNAMSIL by RUF. A number of them have already been reunited with their families.

Paragraph 3 (c): entering of RUF fighters in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme

21. Despite occasional difficulties, the cooperation of RUF with the disarmament programme since 18 May has been encouraging. Disarmament of combatants has been completed in the Kambia, Port Loko, Western Area, Bonthe and Kono districts. The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process in Moyamba (for the Civil Defence Forces (CDF)) and Koinadugu (for both CDF and RUF) districts ended on 22 October. On 24 September, while disarmament successfully commenced in Bo district (for CDF), the process took off at a slow pace in Bombali district, home to RUF headquarters. After dealing with the contentious issues raised by RUF on the slowing down of disarmament in

Bombali district, the programme resumed in full swing in the district on 15 October. It is expected to be completed on 31 October 2001.

Paragraph 3 (d): return of all weapons and other equipment seized from UNAMSIL

22. RUF has returned only 87 weapons, including 31 recovered during the disarmament process, 10 vandalized vehicles and 20 stripped armoured personnel carriers. It is hoped that more UNAMSIL weapons will surface as disarmament continues in the remaining districts of Tonkolili, Pujehun, Kailahun and Kenema.

C. Observations of the Economic Community of West African States

23. A mission of the ECOWAS Mediation and Security Council was sent to Liberia on 26 September 2001. Its members were drawn from the ECOWAS secretariat, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria and Togo. The members of the mission held working sessions with Liberian government officials and exchanged views with members of the diplomatic corps, the Liberian Press Union and the Liberian National Red Cross, in addition to interacting with traders so as to sample the opinion of ordinary Liberians.

24. Most of the contents of the ECOWAS mission report were reflected in my last two reports on Liberia (S/2001/939 and S/2001/965, of 5 and 11 October 2001, respectively). With regard to paragraph 3 of resolution 1343 (2001), however, the ECOWAS mission observed that there were indications that the peace process in the Mano River basin was moving forward and that Liberia should, therefore, be encouraged to become an active member of the international community.

25. The ECOWAS mission made the following additional observations:

(a) The mission lamented the absence of a monitoring mechanism that could have provided raw data for its exercise. It therefore called for the establishment of a mechanism for monitoring the implementation of the sanctions;

(b) It appealed to the international community to encourage and assist non-governmental organizations to resume their pre-sanctions activities;

(c) It observed that even though some of the socio-economic and humanitarian problems being experienced by the people of Liberia predated the sanctions, they have been aggravated further with the imposition of those sanctions.

III. Observations

26. Since the adoption of resolution 1343 (2001), the Government of Liberia has embarked on efforts aimed at improving relations with its Mano River Union partners. Liberia has actively participated in recent ministerial meetings of the Mano River Union, whose decisions and recommendations, if implemented, could go a long way towards restoring confidence and stability in the subregion.

27. In my report of 30 April 2001 (S/2001/424), I stated that the Council should remain engaged with Liberia and its people whatever decision it might take with regard to the sanctions. I wish to reiterate that statement. The parlous economic and social conditions of the Liberian people, the tense security situation in the country and the peace requirements of Sierra Leone and the subregion demand that sustained engagement.

Annex

Documents provided by the Government of Liberia

1. Letter dated 28 June 2001 addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, submitting the second report on initiatives taken and measures being implemented by the Government of Liberia towards compliance with Security Council resolution 1343 (2001), especially paragraph 2 thereof.

2. Letter No. MFA/0257/2-1/'01 addressed to the United Nations Office in Liberia by the Liberian Foreign Minister which tries to encompass the issues raised in resolution 1343 (2001) and the Government's response to them.

3. Report dated 20 August 2001 submitted by the Liberian Ministry of Transport on air traffic management in Liberia.

4. Copy of a letter dated 3 August 2001 from the Ministry of Transport to the Manager of Ghana Airways, requesting passenger manifests on a weekly basis in order to scrutinize any possible violation of the travel ban.

5. Copy of a letter dated 1 April 2001 from the Ministry of Transport to the Deputy Managing Director of WSEASUA Air Transport Company for the same purpose as stated under document 4 above.

6. Copy of a letter dated 1 April 2001 from the Ministry of Transport to SABENA Airlines for the same purpose as stated under document 4 above.

7. Copy of a memorandum dated 30 July 2001 from the Director of Civil Aviation to the Minister of Transport intimating to the latter the cancellation of all Registry agents and airworthiness representation of the Liberian Aircraft Registry.

8. Circular No. 009 distributed worldwide among civil aviation authorities by the Government of Liberia, intimating to the former its decision to revoke the certificates of all Liberian registered aircraft as well as the closure of its Aircraft Registry.

9. Official communication between the Government of Liberia and ICAO intimating to the latter its decision to change its aircraft nationality and registration mark from EL to RL, LI, LB, ML or any other marks acceptable to ICAO in order to stop those who have continued to use its previous registration mark in spite of the act of cancellation already put into force by the Liberian civil aviation authorities.

United Nations S/2001/1026

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 28 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 October 2001 from Mr. Naji Sabri, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. Appended to the Minister's letter is a table showing violations of Iraq's international boundaries committed by United States and British warplanes flying across the demilitarized zone monitored by the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM) in the period from 29 September to 12 October 2001.

There were 58 violations of Iraq's boundaries from bases in Kuwait, and the United States and the United Kingdom continued to enforce the unlawful no-flight zones in northern and southern Iraq with logistic support and funding provided by Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey.

The Minister urges you to instruct UNIKOM to perform its duties in full, to report these violations to the Security Council through you immediately they occur and to specify the number and nationality of the warplanes that violate the demilitarized zone, given that such violations constitute wanton aggression against Iraq and against its people, its sovereignty and its territory, as well as against United Nations peacekeeping operations. He further asks you to alert the Security Council to its responsibility to halt this aggression and ensure that its perpetrators are held accountable for it under international law.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed A. **Aldouri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61426 (E) 051101 071101

Annex to the letter dated 28 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Further to our letter dated 4 October 2001 (S/2001/955, annex), I should like to inform you that United States and British warplanes committed 58 violations of Iraq's international boundaries from bases in Kuwait, from Kuwait's airspace and territorial waters and by way of the demilitarized zone monitored by the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM) in the period from 29 September to 12 October 2001. As shown in the table appended to this letter, the relevant Iraqi agencies have determined that the violations committed were as follows:

1. Armed aerial activity by the United States and the United Kingdom, violating our international boundaries from United States and British bases in Kuwait, from Kuwait's airspace and territorial waters and by way of the demilitarized zone, comprised 58 armed sorties in the following governorates: Dhi Qar, Muthanna, Basrah, Maysan and Qadisiyah.

2. Our technical systems identified the aircraft violating Iraq's airspace on a daily basis as American F-14s, F-15s and F-16s and British Tornadoes.

3. An AWACS aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and an E-2C aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace provided support to all of the United States and British aircraft that carried out armed and hostile sorties, violating Iraq's airspace by way of the demilitarized zone.

4. Between 28 September and 10 October 2001, a total of 16 remotely piloted aircraft violated Iraq's airspace from United States and British bases in Kuwait, from Kuwait's airspace and territorial waters and by way of the demilitarized zone.

All of the violations in question were committed by way of the demilitarized zone in which UNIKOM is stationed. One of UNIKOM's primary responsibilities is to monitor such hostile military operations and to report them and endeavour to halt them immediately.

The enforcement by the United States and the United Kingdom of the no-flight zones in northern and southern Iraq is an internationally unlawful act and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the established norms of international law. It constitutes an illegal use of armed force against Iraq's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and it is to be regarded as an ongoing act of aggression such as accords with the Definition of Aggression approved by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974. Most of the world's countries have condemned the maintenance of the no-flight zones as representing an illegitimate use of force against an independent State. Your predecessor, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, has stated that the claim that the Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq authorize the imposition of the no-flight zones is groundless; and at your press conference of 27 June 2001 you affirmed the same fact yourself. Nevertheless, the United States and the United Kingdom, with logistic support and funding provided by Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, are persisting undeterred in their contempt for the Charter of the United Nations and international law and are engaging in this cowardly terrorist aggression

against Iraqi civilians and against Iraq's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.

The violations being committed by the United States and the United Kingdom involving 10 to 20 military aircraft on a daily basis are tantamount to an unlawful war. The United Nations must take the measures required under the Charter to halt this aggression forthwith and ensure that those who have committed it bear full international responsibility for it, including liability for the payment of compensation to Iraq.

The statements of UNIKOM to the effect that it is unable to monitor or identify these aircraft are untenable in the light of the scientific and technological capabilities that are available or that UNIKOM is in a position to acquire and utilize in order to meet the requirements of its mandate in full and establish the identity and country of the warplanes that are violating Iraq's sovereign airspace, so that the necessary measures can then be taken by the Security Council to halt these violations and acts of aggression. In another respect, even if UNIKOM did not have the systems needed to identify the type and nationality of these aircraft, the fact that they come from the direction of Kuwait confirms that they are those of the United States and the United Kingdom, because these two countries do not deny that they are engaging in aggression against Iraq on a daily basis from Kuwait. Your report on UNIKOM for the period from 28 March to 4 September 2001 (S/2001/913) indicates as much, and paragraph 6 states that "[it should be noted] that the mission's inability to identify the States responsible for conducting such flights is in no way to be understood as condoning them". You also state in the report that the United States and the United Kingdom have acknowledged that they are continuing to enforce a no-flight zone in southern Iraq.

I accordingly urge you once more to instruct UNIKOM to perform its duties in full, to report these violations to the Security Council through you immediately they occur and to specify the number and nationality of the warplanes that violate the demilitarized zone and commit aggression against Iraq, given that this constitutes wanton aggression against Iraq and against its people, its sovereignty and its territory, as well as against United Nations peacekeeping operations. I also ask you to alert the Security Council to its responsibility to halt this aggression and ensure that its perpetrators, namely the United States, the United Kingdom, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, are held accountable for it under international law.

(*Signed*) Naji **Sabri**
Minister for Foreign Affairs

Enclosure

Hostile aerial activity violating Iraq's international boundaries from Kuwait and by way of the demilitarized zone, 29 September-12 October 2001

No.	*Date*	*From*	*Time*	*Type*	*Sorties*	*Altitude (metres)*	*Speed (km h)*	*Areas overflown*
1	29 September-5 October	Kuwait	0945-2000	F-14, F-15, drone	32 (including 8 drones)	8,000-10,500	240-780	Basrah, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Artawi, Jalibah, Shatrah, Qal'at Salih, Salman
2	6-12 October	Kuwait	0720-1820	F-14, F-15, F-16, drone	26 (including 8 drones)	8,000-10,500	240-780	Basrah, Qurnah, Qal'at Salih, Amarah, Nasiriyah, Busayyah, Artawi, Jalibah

Total sorties: 58

Note: The total number of armed aerial violations committed from Kuwaiti territory in the period from 17 December 1998 to 12 October 2001 was 10,523.

United Nations S/2001/1027

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 29 October 2001 from Mr. Naji Sabri, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq. The Minister calls attention to the ongoing wanton aggression against Iraq by United States and British aircraft in the unlawful no-flight zones and to the fact that in the period from 12 to 22 October 2001 they carried out 149 hostile sorties, 46 of them from Saudi Arabia, 47 from Kuwait and 56 from Turkey, as shown in the statement enclosed with the letter. On 13 October such aircraft fired missiles at an Iraqi site in Dhi Qar Governorate, destroying many civilian installations.

The Minister reaffirms the Government of Iraq's condemnation of these acts of aggression against Iraqi territory, and he states that international responsibility for them must be borne by the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the countries that provide the logistic support for this aggression, namely Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey. He further states that Iraq reserves its right, as established by the Charter of the United Nations and international law, to defend itself against this ongoing hostile, terrorist activity. He urges you to perform the duties assigned to you under the Charter by ensuring that this persistent aggression is halted and does not recur and that its perpetrators and the regional parties that associate themselves with it bear full legal responsibility in its regard.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed A. **Aldouri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61420 (E) 011101 021101

Annex to the identical letters dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I should like to inform you that United States of America and the United Kingdom have continued their aerial aggression against the Republic of Iraq and that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the State of Kuwait and the Republic of Turkey have also continued to provide logistic facilities for this aggression. United States and British warplanes based in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey have thus continued to violate the airspace of the Republic of Iraq. They flew 149 armed sorties in the period from 12 to 22 October 2001, 46 of them from Saudi Arabia, 47 from Kuwait and 56 from Turkey, as shown in the statement enclosed herewith. On 13 October such aircraft fired missiles at an Iraqi site in Dhi Qar Governorate, destroying many civilian installations.

The enforcement by the United States and the United Kingdom of the no-flight zones in northern and southern Iraq is an internationally unlawful act and a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and the established norms of international law. It constitutes an illegal use of armed force against the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Iraq, and it is to be regarded as an ongoing act of aggression such as accords with the Definition of Aggression approved by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974.

Most of the world's countries have condemned the maintenance of the no-flight zones as representing an illegitimate use of force against an independent State. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali has stated that the claim that the Security Council resolutions concerning Iraq authorize the imposition of the no-flight zones is groundless. At his press conference of 27 June 2001, Mr. Kofi A. Annan also affirmed this fact. Nevertheless, the United States and the United Kingdom, with logistic support provided by Turkey and with both logistic support and funding provided by Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, are persisting undeterred in their contempt for the Charter of the United Nations and international law and are engaging in this cowardly terrorist aggression against Iraqi civilians and against Iraq's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.

The attacks being launched by United States and British aircraft on Iraqi towns and villages and on structures that are basic to life in the country, including health-care and educational establishments and houses of worship, constitute blatant State terrorism that has now been practised for more than 10 years and has caused the deaths of thousands of Iraqi citizens, has left tens of thousands injured and has brought about the destruction of vital amenities and infrastructure. That the United Nations, the Security Council and you yourself should remain mere spectators in the presence of this aggression and this blatant State terrorism against Iraq raises serious questions about the credibility of the United Nations and about its capacity to apply the norms of the Charter to all without distinction and without the use of double standards.

The Government of Iraq considers that the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom and the countries that associate themselves with this terrorist aggression, namely Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, should bear full

responsibility for their illegal actions. It affirms Iraq's established right under the Charter of the United Nations and international law to exercise its legitimate right to defend itself against this ongoing hostile, terrorist activity. It further urges you to perform the duties assigned to you as they relate to the maintenance of international peace and security, to call upon the governments of the countries in question to halt their continuing aggression against Iraq forthwith and to ensure that those committing the aggression and the regional parties collaborating in that aggression, namely Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, bear full legal responsibility for it.

(*Signed*) Naji **Sabri**
Minister for Foreign Affairs

Enclosure

Violations of the airspace of the Republic of Iraq by United States and British warplanes, 12-22 October 2001

1. In the northern region 56 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 6,000 to 12,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 1200 hours on 13 October 2001, United States and British F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from a base in Turkey and from Turkish airspace penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 16 armed sorties, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Zakho, Dohuk, Irbil, Aqrah, Tall Afar, Rawanduz and Amadiyah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1430 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1030 hours on 17 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Turkey and from Turkish airspace penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 12 armed sorties, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Irbil, Dohuk, Rawanduz, Aqrah, Amadiyah and Zakho areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1300 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1200 hours on 21 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Turkey and from Turkish airspace penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 16 armed sorties, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Zakho, Amadiyah, Baibo, Aqrah, Irbil, Rawanduz, Fadiliyah, Ba`shiqah and Qush areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1410 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 1045 hours on 23 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Turkey and from Turkish airspace penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 12 armed sorties, were supported by an AWACS aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Irbil, Zakho, Aqrah and Ayn Zalah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1415 hours, drove them off.

2. In the southern region 93 armed sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 9,000 to 13,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 1330 hours on 12 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 13 armed sorties, eight of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and five from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Salman, Busayyah, Ashbajah, Artawi, Jalibah, Basrah, Qurnah and Nasiriyah areas. Our air

defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1545 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1500 hours on 13 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Saudi and Kuwaiti airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 11 armed sorties, six of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and five from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Nasiriyah, Samawah, Busayyah, Jalibah, Shatrah, Rifa'i and Artawi areas. The United States and British aircraft fired missiles at an Iraqi site in Dhi Qar Governorate, destroying many civilian installations. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1430 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1315 hours on 15 October 2001, United States and British F-15 aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Saudi and Kuwaiti airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out eight armed sorties from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Busayyah, Jalibah and Salman areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1530 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 1445 hours on 16 October 2001, United States and British F-15 aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out five armed sorties, four of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and one from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Busayyah area. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1545 hours, drove them off.

(e) At 1435 hours on 18 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 11 armed sorties, two of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and nine from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Busayyah, Artawi, Jalibah, Rifa'i, Tib and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1600 hours, drove them off.

(f) At 1225 hours on 19 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 13 armed sorties, eight of them from Saudi

territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and five from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Basrah, Nasiriyah, Jalibah, Busayyah, Artawi and Shatrah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1500 hours, drove them off.

(g) At 1345 hours on 20 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 12 armed sorties, eight of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Basrah, Artawi, Salman, Jalibah and Ashbajah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1345 hours, drove them off.

(h) At 1505 hours on 21 October 2001, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 12 armed sorties, six of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and six from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Busayyah, Salman, Artawi, Lasaf, Amghar and Safwan areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1640 hours, drove them off.

(i) At 1440 hours on 22 October 2001, United States and British F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from bases in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and from Kuwaiti and Saudi airspace and territorial waters penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out eight armed sorties, four of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti territory and by way of the demilitarized zone between Iraq and Kuwait with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Lasaf, Artawi, Ashbajah, Busayyah and Jalibah areas. Our air defences, acting in exercise of the legitimate right to defend the homeland, engaged the aircraft and, at 1625 hours, drove them off.

United Nations S/2001/1028

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 31 October 2001 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 22 October 2001 (S/2001/988) concerning the request of the Government of Papua New Guinea for assistance from the United Nations in the implementation of the Bougainville Peace Agreement, especially in the area of weapons collection and disposal, has been brought to the attention of the members of the Council. They welcome your intention to respond positively to the request of the Government of Papua New Guinea, which is also supported by the Bougainville parties, taking note of the financial implications of the expanded functions of the United Nations Political Office in Bougainville (Papua New Guinea).

(*Signed*) Richard **Ryan**
President of the Security Council

01-61357 (E) 311001

United Nations S/2001/1029

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to Security Council resolution 1284 (1999) which requires me to consult the Security Council and the Executive Chairman of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) on the appointment of suitably qualified experts as UNMOVIC commissioners.

Robert Einhorn resigned on 15 October 2001 and I would like to propose the appointment of John S. Wolf (United States of America), Assistant Secretary of State for Non-Proliferation. His biographical note is attached for your information (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would bring this matter to the attention of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

01-61370 (E) 311001

Annex

Biographical note: Assistant Secretary of State for Non-Proliferation, John S. Wolf

Mr. Wolf entered the United States Foreign Service in 1970 and served in Australia, Viet Nam, Greece and Pakistan as well as in Washington, D.C. Mr. Wolf was Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs from 1989 to 1992. He served as Ambassador to Malaysia from 1992 to 1995. He was appointed Coordinator for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) in January 1996, and confirmed by the Senate as Ambassador for APEC in February 1997. In 1999-2000, Mr. Wolf served as Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State for Caspian Basin Energy Diplomacy. Assistant Secretary Wolf graduated from Dartmouth College and was a Mid-career Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University.

United Nations S/2001/1030

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 31 October 2001 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 26 October 2001 (S/2001/1029) concerning your proposal to appoint John S. Wolf (United States of America) as a Commissioner of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the proposal contained in your letter.

(*Signed*) Richard **Ryan**
President of the Security Council

01-61377 (E) 311001

United Nations S/2001/1031

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 29 October 2001 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

As you are aware, my Special Adviser, Mohamed Sahnoun, has been following developments in the Horn of Africa subregion, especially Somalia and the Sudan, and has been providing assessment and advice on what useful role the United Nations could play in those countries. He has also been representing me in meetings of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the IGAD Partners Forum devoted to the two countries.

I have decided to extend the appointment of my Special Adviser until 31 December 2002.

I should be grateful if you would bring the present letter to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

01-61383 (E) 311001

United Nations S/2001/1032

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 31 October 2001 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 29 October 2001 (S/2001/1031) concerning your decision to extend the appointment of Mohamed Sahnoun as your Special Adviser on Africa until 31 December 2002 has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council. They take note of the decision contained in your letter.

(*Signed*) Richard **Ryan**
President of the Security Council

01-61395 (E) 311001

United Nations A/56/519–S/2001/1033

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
31 October 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session
Agenda item 166
Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of a statement of 29 October 2001 by an official source at the Foreign Ministry of the State of Qatar condemning and denouncing the massacre of innocent civilians in Pakistan.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 166, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nassir Abdulaziz **Al-Nasser**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61346 (E) 311001 311001

Annex to the letter dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Qatar to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: Arabic]

In a statement by an official source at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Qatar News Agency, the State of Qatar has reaffirmed its condemnation and repudiation of the massacre of innocent civilians, irrespective of place and time, on the grounds that such an action is not sanctioned by divine law, humanitarian values or international covenants, particularly those relating to the role of worship.

In that context, the official source at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed his condemnation of the attack on several churches in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan which resulted in a number of civilian fatalities.

The official source restated the firm position of the State of Qatar in condemning terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.

29 October 2001

United Nations S/2001/1034

Security Council

Distr.: General
1 November 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 30 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter from Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of Iraq, to the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed A. **Aldouri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61471 (E) 051101 051101

Annex to the letter dated 30 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

President Saddam Hussein addresses a third open letter to the peoples and Governments of the West

President Saddam Hussein has addressed a third open letter to the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America. The text of the letter reads as follows:

In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate

Once again we address a letter to all the peoples and Governments of the West, including the United States of America.

Peace be upon those who expect a greeting of peace from us or who say, when such a greeting is addressed to them: "And peace be upon you".

The entire world focused its attention on following and analysing the events of last September. While those who concerned themselves with an in-depth analysis may not have been the majority, it seems to us that their number has now increased, as has the number of Government officials who are taking a deeper look at the background and causes of those events as well as the consequences. At the time when the events occurred, however, both their number and the level of their response were distressing to anyone who did not realize that not everyone is capable of a deeper insight into major events or complex circumstances, just as not many are capable of dreaming of something better.

Now that the emotional reaction to the events has somewhat subsided in the hearts and minds of both those who were elated and those who were distressed, I think that the role of leaders, backed by their peoples, must be based on a description of responsibility and the role of leaders. The most important attribute of a leader and of leadership is saving people from danger, not merely by signalling dark pits along the road, but also by preventing those who do not see the signs from falling into an abyss. After that comes the attribute of advancement, of elevating the condition of those for whom the leader is responsible and the capacity to think and to act that they possess and have stored, so that they reach a higher level. Any danger that confronts a people or a nation requires of those responsible not merely a leadership role against the peril, but also a study of its causes with a view to their mitigation or radical treatment, so as to eliminate them altogether or render them unable to spring back up.

Unfortunately, the general trend in that direction is still weak, and Western Governments exhibit the most outstanding inability when it comes to finding the right approach. Indeed, some voices have arisen among the people, to some extent among journalists and writers and, in a very limited way, among the ranks of those who are preparing themselves in the background to replace those in power there. The latter voices, however, are still hesitant and deal with the situation according to what they see as advantageous with regard to the posts they seek to occupy and the influence of the related centres of power. As far as the United States is concerned, until now the hope that its people might become aware, if confronted with the naked facts, is greater than one might expect from its administration, except if such

administrations become liberated from the overriding ascendancy of zionism and other centres of influence that act in their own interest in accordance with their own well-known objectives.

The events of 11 September and the angry or opportunistic reactions that followed them, including the brutal aggression against Afghanistan based on a suspicion and the accompanying innuendos and statements emanating from the media or from officials, both American and non-American, have shown that the entire world could be set ablaze by a spark from the West, even one coming from beyond the Atlantic. Starting a fire, however, is naturally easier than extinguishing it. And because good deeds are uplifting, while evil deeds cause the soul to sink to lower levels, doing evil is easier for those who are so inclined.

On the basis of this realistic picture, the entire world needs to save itself from a bottomless chasm towards which it might be pushed by the United States of America and others like it, be they States, individuals or organizations. In fact, the United States, given what we know about how its leaders behave in crises, needs to be saved by the world as the world saves itself rather than being pulled down by the weight of the United States as it falls into a fathomless pit from which there is no emerging until it fills up with blood and tragic casualties, if it does not drown those who cannot swim.

As we have said before to those who committed aggression against us in 1991 and thereafter, including the United States, both during and before the glorious "mother of battles", the world, like Iraq and its Arab nation, needs to have the Iraqi people remain steadfast in the face of aggression, foil aggressive efforts and not allow the United States to triumph, because a victory of the United States and its allies over Iraq, God forbid, would eliminate the opposition and the other view in the international and regional arena and not allow it to re-emerge for a long time. And when tyranny and oppression are encouraged ... Indeed, the United States is not in need of any further conceit or arrogance: had it triumphed over Iraq at the time, God forbid, its additional conceit would have driven it to yet greater conceit, moving it and, with it, the world even closer to the abyss, rather than further from it.

Yes, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, conceit and arrogance need someone to confront them and oppression needs someone to confront it, just as making light of committing evil deeds and throwing anthrax at people need someone to confront them. In line with what we have said regarding Iraq, which confronts those who commit aggression against it, the world now needs to thwart the hostile schemes of the United States, including its brutal aggression against the people of Afghanistan. That aggression must be stopped.

Once again we say that whenever someone feels that he is wronged, and no one fends off from him the injustice or puts an end to it, he will seek by himself a way to throw off the injustice. Clearly, not everyone is able to find the best way to rid himself of the injustice; people turn to whatever they think is best based on their own efforts and their own reasoning. Not everyone is able to exert himself beyond what is immediately at hand, in order to arrive at the optimum idea or means.

In order for one who suffers injustice to find the best way, after finding his way to God and discovering his rights and the rights of others with respect to him, he must not be isolated from the natural environment of which he is a part, nor must he be ignored, either deliberately or through underestimation, by the persons

responsible for that environment; rather, they should make him feel secure and help him to save himself and his environment.

It is natural to say that punishment commensurate with evil action is necessary in this worldly life, for whatever is necessary in the next life contains a sign pointing to its necessity in this life as well. However, punishment in the next life is just, and the prophets, may peace be upon them all, when warning of punishment in the next life or punishment in this world, did so in accordance with God's command that there be justice, not on the basis of a suspicion or whim. Any punishment meted out by humans, if it is to be convincing, must be fair and serve the purpose of justice. I think that you, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, or at least those who govern you, often criticize those whom you decide to criticize in order to weaken them among the States of the world, outside the West, for operating on the basis of emergency laws, for such laws, as you see it, cannot correct a general principle. Yet now, in contradiction to the remarks we have grown accustomed to hearing against those whom you accuse of dictatorship and authoritarian rule, we are seeing dozens of emergency measures and laws being adopted by the Governments of Western States, first and foremost the United States, as a result of a single painful event that has befallen them.

Do you realize, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, how many painful events have befallen the countries and peoples you have been accusing of being undemocratic? And are you aware that what has befallen them is more momentous and more serious than the events that occurred in the United States on 11 September?! This in itself ought, for example, to be a matter of concern to both the Governments and peoples of the West, though it is not our main subject here.

Once again, we say that injustice, and the resulting pressure on people, lead to explosions and that, as explosions are not orderly everyday events, they can be expected to harm those who cause them, and other people as well, and their impact maybe greater than was intended. It is in this light, and in the light of the unbalanced reactions on the part of supposedly democratic Governments, that the events of 11 September should be seen, if the Americans, and the world, are certain that the perpetrators came from abroad.

But let us focus not on these important matters but rather on what is the most important of all: we say again, now it is clear that any fire can spread over the entire world, that justice must, first and foremost, be based on equity and that force should be used not for its own sake or opportunistically but rather in order to achieve the best outcome. The highest expression of this lies in the example of what Almighty God has ordained. Even if we fundamentally disagree on our understanding of this, we should not prevent others from having access to and enjoying what we want for ourselves, and we should not adopt double standards towards others by giving them what we do not want and what we reject for ourselves. We must understand that no one who has a fortune can be secure or keep it safely in a society of starving people. A wealthy man will be in worse trouble if he has made his fortune at the expense of the hungry, by exploiting them. The Second Caliph in the state of Islam, Umar ibn al-Khattab (may God be pleased with him) ordered that the punishment of a thief by cutting off his hand in the year of Ramada should be set aside despite the fact that the sentence was clearly prescribed in the Koran. He did so because his sense as a true believer told him that the correct standards of the faith may be inadequate when a man and his family are starving, and because he regarded hunger as something

more heinous than theft, and considered that saving someone from ruin was more important than protecting a person's property. He suspended a provision of Islamic law. Do the people of our own time follow that precept so as to live in peace and security? Or do those concerned imagine that the security they seek for themselves will be achieved by stepping up the killing, intimidation and starvation of others?

We have heard in the news recently that American officials think that the source of the anthrax is the United States itself. We do not know whether this conclusion, or item of information, is merely a tactic to divert attention from the statement, which terrified some people, that the source of the disease was bin Laden, an accusation which, together with other accusations that have been made, led many Americans to say that they should not persist in harming the people he cares for because that might provoke them to react more strongly, or whether the person who put out the information, took the view — in order to divert the attention of public opinion in the United States from the inadequacy of American officialdom following the events of 11 September — that the purpose had been achieved and that the deed should be buried and the perpetrators forgotten about.

In any case, this and other things show that weapons of mass destruction become a burden to those who possess them, and to mankind, if they are not absolutely necessary for self-defence and for national defence. For that reason, instead of busying themselves and the world with the so-called anti-missile defence system, exhausting their coffers and those of others, emptying the pockets of American taxpayers and involving themselves and others in hostility against one people or another, Americans should first of all set about eliminating the weapons of mass destruction in the United States itself, and at the same time, or later, doing so in the rest of the world. It goes without saying that the West, including the United States, was the first to create weapons of mass destruction, in other words nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, and it was the West, led by the United States, that was the first to use such weapons. The events of September, and statements by the Americans themselves to the effect that the anthrax had its source in the United States, clearly indicate the importance of world cooperation, based on a binding treaty, to eliminate the burden and threat of weapons of mass destruction as a first step that might encourage the taking of other steps if injustice and aggression are to diminish. The primary danger to mankind and to the people of the United States of America is American weapons of mass destruction and similar weapons belonging to the Zionist entity and ultimately those of other States.

As the United States is on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, it is the first country to be asked to take such an initiative in order to confirm its credibility. And as the Zionist entity has seized Arab territory and holy places and oppresses the Arabs and violates their humanity, and as stupid behaviour is to be expected from it, and because the reaction of the oppressed people against the oppressor is also to be expected, it is obviously necessary to divest the Zionist entity of those weapons.

At that stage, when the United States is really willing to divest itself of such weapons, we do not think that any rational person in the world will dissociate himself from such a practical plan.

The NATO aggressors are not likely to oppose the United States, for the United States has less need of such weapons than other States, and it is therefore incumbent on the United States to make a start on its own so that the world may follow its example.

Only then will the United States be dealing even-handedly with the world and pursuing wise policies, and the world will treat it with respect and love when it senses respect and love on the part of the United States. The world, including the United States, will live in peace rather than on the brink of a precipice. Any disagreement that troubles the prevailing calm will be controlled on the basis of genuine solidarity, the solidarity of the brave and the just and not solidarity that is based on intimidation by the powerful or that seeks to gain an advantage or to further certain interests.

I pray to Almighty God that I have conveyed the message, and let God be my witness.

God is great.

God is great.

Saddam Hussein

29 October 2001

United Nations S/2001/1035

Security Council

Distr.: General
1 November 2001

Original: English

Letter dated 31 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Liberia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Upon the instruction of my Government, I have the honour to forward herewith a self-explanatory letter addressed to you by His Excellency Dahkpanah Dr. Charles Ghankay Taylor, President of the Republic of Liberia (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Lami **Kawah**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61464 (E) 011101

Annex to the letter dated 31 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Liberia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Having complied with the demands of the Security Council, the Government of Liberia avails itself of this opportunity to renew its call for the lifting of the regime of sanctions imposed under resolution 1343 (2001).

The Government and people of Liberia were assured that sanctions were to be applied in an even-handed non-porous way and that, having complied with the demands of the Security Council, the Council would be prepared to fulfil its commitments and have the sanctions lifted. The Council demanded that the Liberian Government expel all RUF members, cease all financial and military support to the RUF, prohibit the importation of uncertificated Sierra Leonean diamonds, freeze all assets of the RUF in Liberia and ground aircraft under the Liberian registry.

The Government of Liberia has expelled all RUF members, there is no financial and military support provided to RUF, a moratorium on the export of Liberian diamonds is being enforced, assets identified to be owned by individuals associated with the RUF have been frozen and licences of aircraft operators under the Liberian registry have been revoked. Confirmation of these and other measures taken by the Government of Liberia, in full compliance with the demands of the Security Council, has been documented and forwarded to the United Nations. More importantly, the report of the Panel of Experts pursuant to Security Council resolution 1343 (2001), in paragraph 19, concerning Liberia, revealed no violations attributable to the Government of Liberia since the effective date of the resolution. Alleged violations contained in the report precede resolution 1343 (2001). Paragraph 11 of resolution 1343 (2001) provides for the immediate termination of the measures imposed if the Council determines that the Government of Liberia has complied with its demands. Evidently, there exists no further basis for the continued application of the regime of sanctions imposed by resolution 1343 (2001).

Furthermore, paragraph 3 of the resolution stresses the intent of the demands of the Security Council as being to "... lead to further progress in the peace process in Sierra Leone ...". The Government of Liberia is particularly pleased to note the success of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) in achieving the substantial disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of RUF and other militias; the deployment of UNAMSIL and the extension of the authority of the Sierra Leonean Government into areas formerly under the control of the RUF; the return of weapons and other equipment seized from UNAMSIL and the release of abductees. 30 November 2001 and 14 May 2002 are dates set for the completion of the disarmament process and the conduct of national elections. It is our understanding from recent reports that all sides have expressed optimism that these dates are realizable and that the peace process is irreversible. Reaffirming the continued support of the Liberian Government to the Sierra Leonean peace process and the mandate of UNAMSIL, the Government of Liberia believes that the intent of the Security Council has been realized and all moral basis further removed for the continued application of the regime of sanctions.

Additionally, in sustaining the progress achieved in the Sierra Leonean peace process and in order to consolidate peace and security in the Mano River Union (MRU), high-level discussions have taken place in the three capitals, resulting in the

reconstitution of the MRU Joint Security Committee, essentially dedicated to resolve the plague of dissidents, operating to render our common frontier unsafe. A summit meeting of the three Heads of State, scheduled for early 2002, attests to the commitment of the MRU leadership to live in peace and resolve their problems through dialogue. The Government remains firmly committed to this process of dialogue and is reasonably assured that these initiatives will form the basis for sustainable peace, security and the realization of the objectives of the Mano River Union. To this end, the Government of Liberia renews its requests to the international community for assistance and support in the repatriation and resettlement of refugees and internally displaced persons and the revitalization of the various organs of the Union.

However, it is imperative to note that inequities in the administration of resolution 1343 (2001), especially paragraph 4, which states that "... all States in the region take action to prevent armed individuals and groups from using their territory to prepare and commit attacks on neighbouring countries and refrain from any action that might contribute to further destabilization of the situation on the borders between Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone", could undermine the ongoing efforts to consolidate peace and security in the Mano River Union and the West African subregion.

Seemingly oblivious to these numerous positive developments and the intent of resolution 1343 (2001), Global Witness, a British-based propaganda outfit, has launched a devious campaign, with funding assistance from a Liberian opposition group, to extend and expand the current regime of sanctions and prolong the suffering of the Liberian people. Politically motivated, Global Witness accuses the Government of Liberia essentially of the "reckless exploitation of the Liberian rainforest and the use of revenues therefrom to provide arms and ammunition to the RUF".

The capacity of Liberia's rainforest is widely documented by more credible international research. The German Forestry Mission to Liberia concluded in a report that Liberia has an estimated annual allowable cut of 3.2 million cubic metres (m^3) without endangering the environment. The total production and export volumes for fiscal year 2000 are below one million (896,586,108 and 626,657,090 m^3). Three hundred thousand (300,000) trees out of a total of one million are being grown for replanting. This active reforestation exercise will also cover grounds victimized by shifting cultivation and "slash and burn", traditional methods employed by local farmers.

A new national forestry law, enacted in April 2000, forbids clear felling, introduces environmental impact studies, increases the national forest reserves, strengthens the protection thereof, and reinforces the regulatory and monitoring administration of the Forestry Development Authority. Logging companies are by law only permitted to operate annually in land areas not exceeding 4 per cent of the total area of land mapped out in the concession agreement, and only trees which have matured to a specified diameter and have been identified, inspected and approved by the Forestry Development Authority are felled.

Evidently, the larger portion of the West African tropical rainforest exists in Liberia because of public policy as well as the commitment of the Government and logging companies to sustainable forest management practices.

More importantly, available statistics will reveal that the timber industry in Liberia provides employment opportunities for more than 10,000 individuals. It is further estimated that each employee provides livelihood for a minimum of 10 dependants. A total of 100,000 individuals are directly dependent on the timber industry for their livelihood. This is achieved by the payment of over 10 million dollars annually for salaries and benefits. This is in addition to the provision of free primary and secondary school facilities for children of all employees, with substantial assistance in the rehabilitation of public schools in rural Liberia. Timber concerns operate clinics and hospitals at their various operational sites, catering to the health needs of employees and other Liberians. In maverick agreements with the Liberian Government, timber companies have improved major roads and highways across Liberia, ensuring their accessibility throughout the year and improving the constant movement of goods and services throughout the country.

Revenues from the timber sector account for more than 8 per cent of the national budget. However, effective fiscal year 2001/2002, the Government of Liberia has instituted a policy which ensures that 100 per cent of revenue from timber is retained in the various political subdivisions for rural development. Undoubtedly, in the absence of the iron ore sector, the entire economy of rural Liberia, the home of at least 80 per cent of the population, is dependent on the agro-forest industry.

Additionally, as part of its programme to improve the value of its export, the Government has mandated the Liberian timber industry to install saw and plywood milling facilities and veneer plants. These measures will minimize the future export of round logs and increase the value of timber products. Additional and much-needed jobs will also be created. Implementation of this policy has already commenced with the ongoing installation in Buchanan of one of the largest plywood mills in West Africa, which should become operational by December 2001.

That the Liberian nation has been under attack from dissidents in Lofa County, northern Liberia, since April 1999 is an undeniable fact known to the Security Council. The unfortunate loss of Liberian lives, the wanton destruction of property and the massive displacement of inhabitants of the area are well documented and have been repeatedly brought to the attention of the international community by the Government of Liberia. It must be expected that the Liberian Government, acting under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, would utilize every available means to defend its sovereignty, protect its territorial integrity and preserve its people. To this end, the Government of Liberia renews its request to the Security Council to permit the Government of Liberia to adequately provide for the defense of the Liberian nation and the preservation of its sacred heritage. It must be clearly emphasized that the Government of Liberia has neither the will, the means nor the desire to engage in hegemonic aspirations. However, preserving the state and defending the Republic are obligations that the Liberian Government cannot compromise.

The issue of the centralization of revenues of the Liberian Government, evidently an exclusive prerogative of the Government of Liberia, is, however, well settled. By Legislative enactment, the Central Bank of Liberia is the depository of all revenues of the Government. While the Government of Liberia will react favourably to international support and other technical assistance, the international supervision or monitoring of its expenditure will impinge on the sovereignty

authority and responsibility of the Liberian Nation. No responsible government will find such actions acceptable.

Returning to additional measures taken by the Government of Liberia to ensure compliance with the demands of the Security Council, the Government risked severe political and economic consequences when it banned the export of domestically produced diamonds. This action has left a considerable number of Liberians without a source of livelihood. But more importantly, the request of the Government of Liberia to the Security Council for assistance in the establishment of an internationally credible certificate of origin regime, alleviating the hardship imposed by the ban, has yet to be answered.

Finally, the severe social, humanitarian and economic effects of the sanctions on the Liberian Government and the general population are well documented in the report of the Secretary-General in pursuance of paragraph 13 (a) of resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia. The United Nations humanitarian impact study report leaves little doubt that sanctions imposed under resolution 1343 (2001) are engendering punitive effects. The resilience of the Liberian people — having just endured more than seven years of civil strife, more than two years of ongoing insurgency, a paralysed economy, recording little or no international assistance for reconstruction and development, and damaged national infrastructures — is being stretched beyond its limits with the continued application of these sanctions. It would seem a matter of profound obligation to have these sanctions lifted or suspended. Contrarily, it will be unfair and unjust were the United Nations to be led into an extension and/or expansion of the application of the sanctions regime in achieving other and unrelated ends.

In the first report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, it was strongly suggested that "... the international community remain engaged with Liberia and its people" and you reasoned correctly that "external pressure without dialogue may not have a lasting impact on a country that is battling its own armed insurgency and is mired in deep political, economic and social problems". It was the hope of such a constructive engagement between the Government of Liberia and the international community which, in spite of the disagreements with and denials of accusations of gun-running and diamond smuggling, catalysed the policy of compliance with the demands of the Security Council, faithfully undertaken by the Government of Liberia.

The Government of Liberia recommits itself and looks forward to a more positive and rewarding engagement with the international community, particularly the various organs of the United Nations, and requests the Security Council, through you, to empathize with the suffering people of Liberia and have these sanctions lifted or suspended.

The Government of Liberia avails itself of this opportunity to assure you of its highest consideration and requests that you circulate this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Dahkpanah Dr. Charles Ghankay **Taylor**

United Nations A/ES-10/123–S/2001/1036

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
1 November 2001

Original: English

General Assembly
Tenth emergency special session
Agenda item 5
Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Identical letters dated 1 November 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Showing complete disregard for appeals from around the international community to abide by international law and to halt the violence, Israel, the occupying Power, continues to take actions escalating the violence and aggravating already heightened tensions, causing further destruction and deterioration of the situation on the ground in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. In this regard, actions by the Israeli occupying forces in recent weeks have involved in particular acts of extrajudicial killings and assassinations and the seizure of Palestinian towns and cities.

Since my last letter on 30 October 2001, Israeli occupying forces have killed eight more Palestinians, six of them by targeted assassination. Today, Israeli forces using helicopters fired on a taxi in the city of Tulkarem, killing two Palestinians, Yasser Ahmed Abu Asida and Fahmi Abu Eisha. Yesterday, 31 October, the Israeli occupying forces assassinated four Palestinians. In Al-Khalil (Hebron), occupying forces used helicopter missile fire to kill Jameel Jadallah Khalifa. Another Palestinian man, Abdallah Rashid Al-Jaroushi, was assassinated by Israeli tank fire in the city of Tulkarem. Two other Palestinians, Mohammed Merwih Ghanam and Rabie' Mohammed Ghanam, were assassinated in the town of Jabah near the city of Jenin. On that same day, two Palestinian policemen were killed by occupying forces that had incurred deep into the city of Qalqilya. Also, on Wednesday, Israeli occupying forces used tanks and helicopters to seize the Palestinian village of Arrabeh, abducting several Palestinians during that raid.

These most recent assassinations by the Israeli occupying forces constitute additional war crimes for which the Israeli Government must be held responsible. Such actions are being committed by the occupying Power in blatant violation of international law and international humanitarian law, particularly the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 1949. It is imperative for the Security Council to take concrete and speedy action to address

01-61613 (E) 011101

this very serious matter in order to prevent the further deterioration of the critical situation on the ground in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem.

In follow-up of our previous letters to you regarding this grave situation, dated from 29 September 2000 to 30 October 2001 (A/55/432-S/2000/921; A/55/437-S/2000/930; A/55/450-S/2000/957; A/55/466-S/2000/971; A/55/474-S/2000/984; A/55/490-S/2000/993; A/ES-10/39-S/2000/1015; A/ES-10/40-S/2000/1025; A/ES-10/42-S/2000/1068; A/ES-10/43-S/2000/1078; A/ES-10/44-S/2000/1093; A/ES-10/45-S/2000/1104; A/ES-10/46-S/2000/1107; A/ES-10/47-S/2000/1116; A/ES-10/48-S/2000/1129; A/ES-10/49-S/2000/1154; A/ES-10/50-S/2000/1173; A/ES-10/51-S/2000/1185; A/ES-10/52-S/2000/1206; A/ES-10/53-S/2000/1247; A/ES-10/54-S/2001/7; A/ES-10/55-S/2001/33; A/ES-10/56-S/2001/50; A/ES-10/57-S/2001/101; A/ES-10/58-S/2001/131; A/ES-10/59-S/2001/156; A/ES-10/60-S/2001/175; A/ES-10/61-S/2001/189; A/ES-10/64-S/2001/209; A/ES-10/65-S/2001/226; A/ES-10/66-S/2001/239; A/ES-10/67-S/2001/255; A/ES-10/68-S/2001/284; A/ES-10/69-S/2001/295; A/ES-10/70-S/2001/304; A/ES-10/71-S/2001/314; A/ES-10/72-S/2001/332; A/ES-10/75-S/2001/352; A/ES-10/76-S/2001/372; A/ES-10/79-S/2001/418; A/ES-10/80-S/2001/432; A/ES-10/81-S/2001/447; A/ES-10/82-S/2001/463; A/ES-10/83-S/2001/471; A/ES-10/84-S/2001/479; A/ES-10/85-S/2001/486; A/ES-10/86-S/2001/496; A/ES-10/87-S/2001/504; A/ES-10/88-S/2001/508; A/ES-10/89-S/2001/544; A/ES-10/90-S/2001/586; A/ES-10/91-S/2001/605; A/ES-10/92-S/2001/629; A/ES-10/93-S/2001/657; A/ES-10/94-S/2001/669; A/ES-10/95-S/2001/686; A/ES-10/96-S/2001/697; A/ES-10/97-S/2001/708; A/ES-10/98-S/2001/717; A/ES-10/99-S/2001/742; A/ES-10/100-S/2001/754; A/ES-10/101-S/2001/783; A/ES-10/102-S/2001/785; A/ES-10/103-S/2001/798; A/ES-10/104-S/2001/812; A/ES-10/105-S/2001/814; A/ES-10/107-S/2001/821; A/ES-10/108-S/2001/826; A/ES-10/111-S/2001/880; A/ES-10/112-S/2001/918; A/ES-10/114-S/2001/928; A/ES-10/115-S/2001/932; A/ES-10/116-S/2001/941; A/ES-10/117-S/2001/971; A/ES-10/118-S/2001/989; A/ES-10/119-S/2001/991, A/ES-10/121-S/2001/1007 and A/ES-10/122-S/2001/1024), I regret to inform you that the total number of Palestinians killed by the Israeli occupying forces has risen to 742 martyrs (see annex).

I would be grateful if you would arrange to have the present letter and its annex distributed as an official document of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 5, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Nasser **Al-Kidwa**
Ambassador
Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations

Annex to the identical letters dated 1 November 2001 from the Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council

Names of martyrs killed by Israeli occupying forces in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including Jerusalem*

(Wednesday, 31 October 2001 through Thursday, 1 November 2001)

Wednesday, 31 October 2001

1. Jameel Jadallah Khalifa
2. Abdallah Rashid Al-Jaroushi
3. Mohammed Merwih Ghanam
4. Rabie' Mohammed Ghanam
5. Mohammed Jameel Abdel Fata
6. Ra'ed Al-Akhras (18 years old)

Thursday, 1 November 2001

1. Yasser Ahmed Abu Asida
2. Fahmi Abu Eisha

---

* The total number of Palestinian martyrs killed by Israeli occupying forces since 28 September 2000 is 742.

United Nations A/56/520–S/2001/1037

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
6 November 2001
English
Original: Spanish

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session
Agenda item 166
Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to attach herewith the text of the addresses delivered by Mr. Fidel Castro Ruz, President of the Republic of Cuba, on 22 September and 6 October 2001 on the subject of terrorism (see annexes I and II).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex distributed as a document of the General Assembly, under the item entitled "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Bruno **Rodríguez Parilla**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-62265 (E) 091101 121101

Annex I to the letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Address by Mr. Fidel Castro Ruz, President of the Republic of Cuba, at the Tribuna Abierta de la Revolución, San Antonio de los Baños, Havana, on 22 September 2001

No one can deny that terrorism is today a dangerous and ethically indefensible phenomenon that must be eradicated, regardless of its deep economic and political origins and those responsible for them.

The unanimous anger aroused by the human and psychological damage done to the American people by the unexpected and shocking deaths of thousands of innocent people, whose images have shaken the world, is understandable. But who are the ones who have profited from it? The extreme right, the most backward and right-wing forces, those in favour of crushing the growing world rebellion and sweeping away everything progressive that remains on the planet. Whoever organized and was responsible for this act committed an enormous error, a tremendous injustice and a great crime.

Nevertheless, the tragedy should not be used to start a war recklessly, in the name of justice and under the peculiar and bizarre name of "Infinite Justice", that could actually unleash an endless carnage of innocent victims.

In the past few days we have seen the hasty establishment of the foundations, the concept, the true purposes, the spirit and the conditions of such a war. No one could claim that it was not something well thought-out in advance, something that was just waiting for a chance to materialize. After the so-called end of the cold war, those who continued a military build-up and the development of the most sophisticated means of killing and exterminating human beings were aware that their huge military investments would give them the privilege of imposing their absolute and complete dominance over the other peoples of the world. The ideologists of the imperialist system knew very well what they were doing and why they were doing it.

After the shock and sincere sorrow felt by all peoples throughout the world for the atrocious and insane terrorist attack against the people of the United States, the most extremist ideologues and most belligerent hawks, already established in their privileged positions of power, have taken command of the most powerful country in the world, whose military and technological capabilities seem infinite. Its capacity to destroy and kill is enormous, while its inclination towards equanimity, serenity, thoughtfulness and restraint is minimal.

The combination of elements, including complicity and the common enjoyment of privileges with the other powerful and rich countries, and the prevailing opportunism, confusion and panic, make it almost impossible to avoid a bloody and unpredictable outcome.

The first victims of whatever military actions are undertaken will be the billions of people living in the poor and underdeveloped world, with their unbelievably serious economic and social problems, their unpayable debts and the ruinous prices of their basic commodities; their growing natural and ecological disasters; their hunger and extreme poverty; the massive undernourishment of their

children, teenagers and adults; their terrible AIDS epidemic; and their malaria, tuberculosis and infectious diseases, which threaten whole nations with extermination.

The grave world economic crisis was already a real and irrefutable fact affecting absolutely all of the major economic power centres. This crisis will inevitably worsen under the new circumstances, and when it becomes unbearable for the overwhelming majority of people, it will bring chaos, rebellion and the inability to govern.

But the price will also be unpayable for the rich countries. For years to come, it will be impossible to speak out strongly enough about the environment and ecology, or about new ideas, research and testing, or about nature conservation projects because these will be crowded out by military actions, war and crimes as infinite as "Infinite Justice", the name given to the war operations to be unleashed.

Can there be any hope left, after listening to the speech delivered by the United States President before the Congress barely 36 hours ago?

I shall avoid the use of adjectives, qualifiers or offensive words towards the author of that speech. They would be absolutely useless and badly timed, when the tensions and seriousness of the moment favour thoughtfulness and equanimity. I shall limit myself to quoting some short sentences that say it all:

"We will [use] every necessary weapon of war."

"Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other we have ever seen."

"Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists."

"I've called the armed forces to alert, and there is a reason. The hour is coming when America will act, and you will make us proud."

"This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight."

"I ask for your patience [...] in what will be a long struggle."

"[...] the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time, now depends on us."

"The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain [...] and we know that God is not neutral."

I ask our fellow countrymen to meditate deeply and calmly on the ideas contained in several of the above-mentioned sentences.

• "Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists."

No nation of the world has been left out of the dilemma, not even the big and powerful States; none has escaped the threat of war or attack.

• "We will use any weapon."

No procedure has been excluded, regardless of its ethics, nor has any threat, however fatal — nuclear, chemical, biological or any other — been excluded.

- "It will not be a short combat but a lengthy war, lasting many years, unparalleled in history."
- "It is the world's fight; it is civilization's fight."
- "[...] the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time, now depends on us."

Lastly, an unheard-of confession in a political speech on the eve of war, and no less so in a time of apocalyptic danger: "The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain [...] and we know that God is not neutral."

The assertion is astounding. When I think about the real or imagined parties involved in the bizarre holy war that is about to begin, I find it difficult to distinguish which fanaticism is stronger.

On Thursday, before the United States Congress, the idea was put forward of a world military dictatorship under the exclusive rule of force, irrespective of any international law or institution. The United Nations, which has been simply ignored in the present crisis, would fail to have any authority or prerogative whatsoever. There would be only one boss, only one judge and only one law.

We have all been ordered to become allies either with the United States Government or with terrorism.

Cuba, the country that has suffered the most and the longest from terrorist actions, the one whose people are not afraid of anything because there is no threat or power in the world that can intimidate them, courageously proclaims that it is against terrorism and against war. Although the possibility is now remote, Cuba reaffirms the need to avert a war of unpredictable consequences, whose very authors have admitted they have not the slightest idea of how events will unfold. Likewise, Cuba reiterates its willingness to cooperate with every country in the total eradication of terrorism.

An objective and calm friend should advise the United States Government not to cast young American soldiers into an uncertain war in remote, isolated and inaccessible places, where they will fight against ghosts whose whereabouts and even existence is uncertain, not knowing whether the people they kill are responsible or not for the killing of their innocent countrymen in the United States.

Cuba will never declare itself an enemy of the American people, who are today being subjected to an unprecedented campaign to sow hatred and a vengeful spirit, so much so that even the music inspired by the hope of peace has been banned. On the contrary, Cuba will make that music its own, and even our children will sing their songs of peace as long as the announced bloody war lasts.

Whatever happens, the territory of Cuba will never be used for terrorist actions against the American people, and we will do everything within our power to prevent such actions against them. Today we are expressing our solidarity, while urging peace and calmness. One day they will admit we were right.

We shall defend our independence, our principles and our social achievements with honour, to the last drop of blood, if we are attacked.

It will not be easy to fabricate pretexts for such an attack. They are already talking about a war using all necessary weapons, but it will be useful to recall that

not even that would be a new experience. Almost four decades ago, hundreds of strategic and tactical nuclear weapons were aimed at Cuba, and nobody remembers any Cuban losing sleep over that.

We are the same sons and daughters of that heroic people, with a patriotic and revolutionary conscience that is stronger than ever. It is a time for serenity and courage.

The world will become aware of this and will raise its voice in the face of the terrible tragedy it is about to suffer.

As for Cubans, this is the time to proclaim ourselves prouder and more resolute than ever:

Socialism or death!

Homeland or death!

We shall overcome!

Annex II to the letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Address by Mr. Fidel Castro Ruz, President of the Republic of Cuba, at the Tribuna Abierta de la Revolución, Plaza de la Revolución, on 6 October 2001, commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the terrorist attack off the coast of Barbados

History is capricious and is given to strange twists. Twenty-five years ago, in this very same square, we bid farewell to a few coffins containing tiny fragments of the human remains and personal belongings of some of the 57 Cubans, 11 Guyanese — most of them students on scholarships in Cuba — and 5 Korean cultural officials who died as a result of a brutal and incredible act of terrorism. What was especially moving was the death of the entire youth fencing team, male and female, who were returning with all the gold medals they had won in a Central American championship in that sport.

A million of our fellow countrymen, with tears in their eyes, in many cases running down their cheeks, bid a more symbolic than actual farewell to our brothers and sisters whose bodies were lying at the bottom of the ocean.

No one, with the exception of a group of friendly distinguished persons and institutions, shared our sorrow; there was no uproar in the world, no serious political crises, no meetings at the United Nations, no imminent threat of war.

Perhaps few people in the world understood the terrible significance of that act. How important could it be that a Cuban civilian aircraft was destroyed in mid-flight with 73 people on board? It was as if it was a normal occurrence. Had not thousands of Cubans died already in La Coubre, Escambray and the Bay of Pigs and in hundreds of terrorist attacks, acts of piracy and other similar actions? Who was going to attach importance to the complaints of a tiny country? It seemed that a simple denial from our powerful neighbour and its news media, which flooded the world, was sufficient and the matter would be forgotten.

Who could have predicted that almost exactly 25 years later a war with unpredictable consequences would be on the point of breaking out as a result of an equally repugnant terrorist attack which claimed the lives of thousands of innocent people in the United States? Back then, in what now appears to be a tragic omen, innocent people from several countries died; on this occasion human beings from 86 nations perished.

Then, as now, there were hardly any remains of the victims. In Barbados, not a single body could be recovered; in New York, only a few were recovered and not all of those could be identified. In both cases, family members were left with a vast emptiness and immense distress; the horrific crime brought unbearable sorrow and deep indignation to the peoples of each country. These were not accidents or the result of mechanical failures or human error; they were deliberate acts, conceived and carried out in cold blood.

There were, however, some differences between the monstrous crime committed off the coast of Barbados and the inconceivable and sinister terrorist attack against the people of the United States. In the United States, the act was the work of fanatics who were prepared to die alongside their victims; in Barbados, it

was the work of mercenaries who did not run the slightest risk. The main goal in the United States was not to kill the passengers; the perpetrators hijacked the aircraft in order to attack the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, without any concern for the death of the innocent people travelling in them. In Barbados, the basic objective of the mercenaries was to kill the passengers.

In both cases, the anguish suffered by the passengers during the final minutes of their lives, especially those in the fourth aircraft hijacked in the United States — who already knew what had happened in New York and Washington — must have been terrible, like that of the crew and passengers of the Cuban aircraft during the desperate attempt to return to land when it was clearly impossible to do so. In both cases, there were demonstrations of courage and determination: in Barbados, we learned of them from the recorded voices of the Cuban crew, and, in the United States, from reports from that country on the attitude adopted by the passengers.

Moving filmed images have remained of the horrific events in New York. Not a single photograph has remained, nor could remain, of the explosion of the aircraft off the coast of Barbados and its plunge into the sea. The only testimony left is to be found in the dramatic communications between the crew of the doomed aircraft and the control tower at the airport in Barbados.

This was the first time in the history of Latin America that such an act had been instigated from abroad.

In this hemisphere, the systematic use in the political arena of such cruel and terrible practices and procedures was initiated against our country. It was preceded in 1959 by another equally senseless and irresponsible practice: the hijacking and diversion of aircraft in mid-flight, a phenomenon which was practically unknown in the world at that time.

The first attack of this kind was the hijacking of a DC-3 passenger aircraft bound from Havana to the Isla de la Juventud by several former members of the repressive forces of Batista's tyranny, who diverted the aircraft and forced the pilot to fly to Miami on 16 April 1959. This was less than four months after the triumph of the Revolution. The perpetrators of the attack were never punished.

Between 1959 and 2001, a total of 51 Cuban aircraft were hijacked and almost without exception diverted to the United States. Many of these hijacked aircraft were never returned to Cuba. A number of pilots, guards and other people were killed or wounded and several aircraft were destroyed or seriously damaged in failed hijacking attempts.

As a consequence, the plague of hijackings of aircraft in mid-flight soon spread to the United States itself, where, for the most varied reasons, a number of people, most of them unbalanced individuals, adventurers or common criminals, from both the United States and Latin America, began to hijack aircraft, armed with firearms, knives, Molotov cocktails and sometimes just bottles of water made to look as though they contained gasoline, with which they threatened to set the aircraft on fire.

Thanks to the painstaking care of the Cuban authorities, not a single accident occurred upon landing and the passengers always received proper treatment and were immediately returned to their places of origin.

Most of the hijackings and diversions of Cuban aircraft occurred between 1959 and 1973. Faced with the risk of a catastrophe in the United States or Cuba, since there were hijackers who, once they had taken control of an aircraft, threatened to fly it into the Oak Ridge atomic plant if certain demands were not met, the Government of Cuba took the initiative of approaching the Government of the United States — at that time under the Presidency of Richard Nixon and with William Rogers as Secretary of State — with a proposal for an agreement to deal with cases of hijacking of aircraft and piracy at sea. The proposal was accepted and the agreement was quickly drawn up; it was signed by representatives of the two Governments on 15 February 1973 and immediately published in the Cuban press and given wide coverage.

This reasonable and well-drafted agreement established heavy penalties for hijackers of aircraft and ships. It served as a deterrent. From that date on, there was a considerable reduction in the number of Cuban aircraft hijacked; during a period of over 10 years every attempted hijacking in Cuba failed.

The brutal terrorist attack that led to the explosion of the Cuban aircraft in mid-flight dealt a devastating blow to this excellent and effective agreement. As a result of this inconceivable act of aggression and taking into account the fact that it occurred in the middle of a new wave of terrorist acts against Cuba unleashed towards the end of 1975, the Cuban Government denounced the agreement, in accordance with the clauses stipulated therein. However, it retained in force, unchanged, the measures set out in the agreement against the hijacking of United States aircraft, including the application of severe penalties which, under the agreement, had been increased to sentences of up to 20 years' imprisonment. Even before the agreement was signed, the Cuban courts had been applying the penalties established in our Penal Code against aircraft hijackers, although the penalties were less severe.

Despite the strict application of the penalties, a few United States aircraft were hijacked and diverted to Cuba. After due advance warning, the Cuban Government returned two hijackers to the United States on 18 September 1980, handing them over to the United States authorities.

During the period from September 1968 to December 1984, 71 incidents were recorded of aircraft being hijacked and diverted to Cuba. According to the records, 69 participants in those hijackings were tried and sentenced to terms of imprisonment of between three and five years; subsequently, after the signing of the 1973 agreement, sentences ranged from 10 to 20 years.

As a result of the measures taken by Cuba, there has not been a single incident of the hijacking or diversion of a United States aircraft to Cuba in the past 17 years.

What, on the other hand, has been the attitude of the United States? From 1959 until today, the United States authorities have not punished a single one of the hundreds of individuals who have hijacked and diverted to that country dozens of Cuban aircraft, not even those who committed murder in carrying out the hijacking.

It is impossible to conceive of a greater lack of basic reciprocity or a greater incitement to the hijacking of aircraft and ships. This rigid policy has been maintained for over 42 years, without a single exception, and is still being maintained.

The constructive agreement between the Governments of Cuba and the United States on the hijacking of aircraft and ships, the results of which were immediately evident, was apparently accepted by the principal leaders of the terrorist groups. Some had cooperated or participated actively in the organization of irregular warfare, through armed groups which, at certain times, extended throughout the six former provinces of the country. The majority of them had been recruited by the United States Government in the days of the Bay of Pigs invasion and the Cuban missile crisis, and in later years, to take part in all kinds of violent actions, especially in assassination plots and terrorist attacks that did not leave any sphere of economic and social life untouched or rule out any method, any procedure or any weapon.

They attended all kinds of institutions, schools and training programmes, at times to be trained and at other times to be entertained.

Dramatic events such as the Kennedy assassination gave rise to major investigations, including those carried out by a United States Senate committee. The embarrassing situations and scandals which resulted compelled a change of tactic but no genuine change of policy towards Cuba, which explains why, after relative periods of calm, there were new waves of terrorism.

That is what happened in late 1975. The Church Commission had submitted its well-known report on plots to assassinate the leaders of Cuba and other countries on 20 November of that year. The Central Intelligence Agency could not continue to assume direct responsibility for assassination plots and terrorist acts against Cuba. The solution was simple: the most trustworthy and best-trained terrorist personnel would form groups which would act independently and on their own authority. This led to the sudden birth of a bizarre coordinating organization called CORU, which was made up of the principal terrorist groups. As a rule, those groups were sharply divided by leadership ambitions and self-interest. A violent wave of terrorist actions was unleashed. In mentioning just a few of them, taken from the many major acts of terrorism which were committed during this new period, I would point out that the following occurred within the space of only four months:

Pirate speedboats from Florida attacked two fishing boats on 6 April 1976, causing the death of one fisherman and severe damage to the boats;

A bomb planted in the Embassy of Cuba in Portugal killed two members of the diplomatic staff, inflicted serious injuries on a number of other staff and totally destroyed the premises on 22 April;

An assault with explosives was perpetrated against the Cuban Mission to the United Nations on 5 June, causing serious material damage;

A bomb exploded in the van carrying the luggage for a Cubana Airlines flight at Kingston airport, Jamaica, on 9 July, moments before it was due to be loaded aboard;

A bomb exploded in the offices of British West Indies Air in Barbados, which represented the interests of Cubana Airlines in that country, on 10 July;

A fisheries expert was murdered during the attempted kidnapping of the Cuban consul in the Mexican city of Mérida on 24 July;

Two members of the Cuban Embassy staff in Argentina were kidnapped on 9 August and were never heard from again;

A bomb exploded in the offices of Cubana Airlines in Panama on 18 August, causing considerable damage.

This shows clearly that a real war was in progress. The airlines were the target of a number of attacks.

The New York Times and *US News and World Report* called it a new wave of terrorism against Cuba.

The groups making up CORU, which began operations in early 1976 although it was not officially constituted until June of that year, issued public statements in the United States claiming responsibility for each of the acts they perpetrated. They sent war dispatches, as they called them, from Costa Rica to the Miami press. In August, one of their organs published an article under this very title, "War dispatch", describing the destruction of a Cuban embassy. That same day, it did not hesitate to publish a particularly significant communiqué signed by the five terrorist groups that made up CORU: "We shall very soon attack aircraft in mid-flight".

To carry out their strikes, the CORU terrorists utilized without difficulty as their principal bases of operation the territories of the United States, Puerto Rico, Somoza's Nicaragua and Pinochet's Chile.

Only eight weeks later, the aircraft with 73 persons on board would be blown up off the coast of Barbados.

Hernán Ricardo and Freddy Lugo, the two Venezuelan mercenaries who planted the bomb on the Trinidad and Tobago-Barbados leg of the flight, left the plane in Barbados, returned to Trinidad, were arrested and immediately admitted their involvement.

The Barbados Police Commissioner stated before an investigative committee that Ricardo and Lugo had admitted that they worked for the CIA. He added that Ricardo had pulled out a CIA card and a second card setting out the rules for the use of C-4 plastic explosives.

On 24 October 1976, *The New York Times* reported that the terrorists who had launched a wave of attacks in seven countries during the past two years were the products and instruments of the CIA.

The Washington Post noted that contacts confirmed with the United States Embassy in Venezuela cast doubt on the statement issued on 15 October by the United States Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, to the effect that nobody connected with the United States Government had had anything to do with sabotage of the Cuban aircraft.

A correspondent of the Mexican newspaper *Excelsior* then commented from Port of Spain that, thanks to the admission by Hernán Ricardo Lozano, the Venezuelan detained in Trinidad, for responsibility for the attack on a Cubana Airlines aircraft which had crashed off the coast of Barbados with 73 persons on board, a major anti-Castro terrorist network somehow connected with the CIA was about to be exposed.

Le Monde stated that the CIA connection with groups of Cuban-born terrorists who moved freely on United States soil was public knowledge.

Many of the most highly respected organs of the international press expressed a similar opinion.

Luis Posada Carriles and Orlando Bosch, who masterminded the terrorist crime and had been associated with the CIA since 1960, were arrested and underwent a tortuous trial, plagued with irregularities, amidst enormous pressure. The Venezuelan judge, Delia Estaba Moreno, instituted legal proceedings against them for murder, the manufacture and use of firearms, and forgery and possession of false documents. Her upright attitude elicited a violent reaction from the extreme right-wing political mafia.

General Elio García Barrios, the presiding judge of the Military Court, maintained a firm and decisive stance, thanks to which the two terrorists were required to serve a prison term of several years. The Miami terrorist mafia took their revenge by riddling one of his sons with bullets in 1983.

Posada was rescued by the Cuban-American National Foundation, which sent US$ 50,000 via Panama to finance his escape. The day of the escape was 18 August 1985. In a matter of hours, he turned up in El Salvador. No sooner had he arrived than he was visited by the leaders of the Foundation. It was the time of the dirty war in Nicaragua. He was immediately entrusted with important tasks by the White House, which asked him to supply weapons and explosives by air to the counter-revolutionaries in Nicaragua.

The meaning and magnitude of the tragedy go far beyond the cold figure of 73 innocent persons murdered in Barbados.

Americans would certainly grasp its magnitude more fully if they were to compare the Cuban population of 25 years ago with the United States population on 11 September 2001. The death of 73 persons aboard a Cuban aircraft blown up in mid-air is equivalent, in United States terms, to seven aircraft owned by United States airlines, each with more than 300 passengers aboard, destroyed in mid-flight on the same day, at the same time, by a terrorist conspiracy.

If we go a little further and take into account the 3,478 Cubans who have died in over four decades as a result of acts of aggression, including the Bay of Pigs invasion and all the terrorist acts against Cuba which originated in the United States, it is as though 88,434 people had died in the latter country, a figure almost equal to the number of Americans who died in the Korean and Viet Nam wars combined.

These words of denunciation are not inspired by hatred or rancour. I understand that United States officials do not want to even hear mention of these embarrassing matters. They say that we should look ahead.

It would, however, be senseless not to look back to see where the mistakes were made which must not be repeated and what are the causes of major human tragedies, wars and other disasters that might have been avoided. Innocent people should not have to die anywhere in the world.

We have staged this massive protest against terrorism as a homage and a tribute to the memory of our brothers and sisters who died off the coast of Barbados 25 years ago, but also as an expression of solidarity with the thousands of innocent

people who died in New York and Washington and a condemnation of the brutal crime committed against them. We seek ways of eradicating terrorism once and for all, of ensuring peace and avoiding a bloody and interminable war.

I am utterly convinced that the ties between the anti-Cuba terrorist groups set up in the United States during the first 15 years of the Revolution and the authorities of that country have never been severed.

On a day such as this, we are entitled to ask ourselves what action will be taken against Posada Carriles and Orlando Bosch, who were responsible for the horrendous terrorist act in Barbados, and against those who planned and financed the planting of bombs in hotels in the capital city and the attempts on the lives of Cuban leaders, which have not let up for even a minute in over 40 years.

It is not too much to ask that these professionals of terrorism be brought to justice. From the very territory of the United States, they have not ceased to apply their insidious craft against our people, in order to sow terror and destroy the economy of a harassed and blockaded country, even though not one terrorist device nor even one gram of explosive has ever left our territory to cause an explosion in the United States. Not one American has been killed or injured, not one facility, large or small, in that immense and rich land has suffered the slightest material damage as the result of an action initiated in Cuba.

In the global struggle against terrorism, to which we have committed ourselves alongside the United Nations and the rest of the international community, we have the necessary moral authority and the right to demand an end to the terrorism against Cuba . The economic war to which our people have been subjected for more than 40 years, in what amounts to a genocidal and brutal action, must also cease.

Our brothers and sisters in Barbados who died off the coast of Barbados are no longer simply martyrs. They are symbols in the struggle against terrorism. They rise today like giants in this historic battle which we are waging to eradicate terrorism from the face of the earth and to do away with a repugnant tactic which has injured their country so severely and heaped so much suffering on their loved ones and their nation, a nation that has already written pages without precedent in the annals of its homeland and its times.

Their lives have not been sacrificed in vain. Injustice is starting to tremble before an energetic and virile nation, which wept with indignation and sorrow 25 years ago and today weeps with emotion, hope and pride as it remembers them.

History, in its capriciousness, has wanted it that way.

On behalf of the martyrs of Barbados:

Socialism or Death!

Homeland or Death!

We shall overcome!

United Nations A/56/521-S/2001/1038

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
6 November 2001
English
Original: Spanish

General Assembly
Fifty-sixth session
Agenda item 166
Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Security Council
Fifty-sixth year

Letter dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a summary prepared by the National Assembly of People's Power of the Republic of Cuba concerning the principal terrorist actions against Cuba during the period 1990-2000 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would arrange for this letter and its annex to be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under the item "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", and of the Security Council.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) Bruno **Rodríguez Parrilla**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-62284 (E) 091101 121101

Annex to the letter dated 29 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Summary of principal terrorist actions against Cuba (1990-2000)

Since 1959, counter-revolutionary groups established and run by the United States Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) have committed a number of terrorist acts, which have cost our country valuable lives and vast resources.

In the early 1990s, encouraged by the collapse of the socialist camp, these groups acting from United States territory and other bases of operations in Central America intensified their violent actions against the people of Cuba and their leaders.

Details are given below of some of the most important of these, about which information has been made public:

17 July 1990. After lobbying by the Florida Republican Congresswomen Ileana Ros and Connie Mack, the President of the United States, George Bush, released the known terrorist Orlando Bosch, who master-minded the attack which destroyed a Cuban civilian aircraft in mid-flight in October 1976, killing all 73 persons on board.

14 October 1990. Armed infiltration via Santa Cruz del Norte organized from Miami of two terrorists with orders to commit acts of violence. Their weapons and forged documents issued in Miami were confiscated.

They were carrying flyers inviting people to join the so-called "*Cuban Liberation Army*" led by Higinio Diaz Anne, who gave them money and leaflets before their departure.

15 May 1991. José Basulto, former Bay of Pigs mercenary, known terrorist and CIA agent, founded the so-called "*Brothers to the Rescue*" and for that purpose asked the United States President, George Bush, for three United States Air Force 0-2 aircraft, the military version of the Cessna, which had been used during the war in El Salvador. Congresswoman Ileana Ros campaigned publicly and lobbied for the three aircraft to be provided. On 19 July 1992, the first photos appeared in the press of the aircraft provided to this counter-revolutionary group with the acronym USAF clearly visible, in an article by the publisher of *The Miami Herald*, who had flown in them.

17 September 1991. Infiltration of two counter-revolutionaries from Miami for the purpose of sabotaging shops frequented by tourists in order to spread terror among foreign tourists. Their weapons and a radio transmitter were confiscated.

29 December 1991. Infiltration of three terrorists from the so-called Comandos L from Miami, whose weapons and other military equipment were confiscated.

These terrorists had received training at a camp on 168th Street in Miami, where about 50 or 60 other men were also trained.

8 May 1992. Cuba denounced the terrorist activities against its territory at the United Nations. At its request, an official Security Council document was issued containing a decision of the United States Department of Justice dated 23 June 1989 declaring that Orlando Bosch was excludable from United States territory because of extensive evidence of his past and present terrorist activities, including the bombing of a Cuban airliner in 1976.

This person is now freely walking the streets of Miami, following a presidential pardon granted to him by President George Bush.

4 July 1992. A group of terrorists from the United States tried to attack economic targets along the Havana coastline. When detected by Cuban patrols, they moved to waters off Varadero, where the vessel broke down and was rescued by the United States Coast Guard.

Although their weapons, maps and video cassettes made during the voyage were confiscated, the terrorists were released by the FBI.

July 1992. Failure of an operation to infiltrate a terrorist from the United States, who was going to sabotage an economic target in the province of Villa Clara.

He had the necessary weapons and explosives to carry out this plan and was being assisted by "*Brothers to the Rescue*", who reported to him the position of the United States Coast Guard in order to make it easier for him to reach Cuban territory.

9 September 1992. A terrorist of Cuban origin detained by the FBI for illegal possession of firearms and violation of the Neutrality Act was released without charges.

7 October 1992. Armed attack on the Melia Varadero Hotel from a vessel manned by four terrorists from Miami, who were detained and questioned by the FBI and released.

19 October 1992. Infiltration of three counter-revolutionaries from the United States, from whom weapons and considerable amounts of military equipment were confiscated. At the same time, three other terrorists were detained in the territory of the Bahamas, from whom weapons and explosives apparently destined for Cuba were also confiscated. These counter-revolutionaries had left Miami on 17 October.

January 1993. The United States Coast Guard detained five terrorists on board a gunboat with heavy machine guns and other weapons as they were approaching the Cuban coastline. They were released.

7 January 1993. Tony Bryant, leader of the terrorist group "Comandos L", announced at a Miami press conference plans to carry out more attacks against targets in Cuba, especially hotels. He said "*from now on, we are at war with Cuba*" and warned foreign tourists to "*stay away from Cuba*".

2 April 1993. About 7 miles north of Matanzas, the Cypriot-owned tanker *Mikonos* was fired on from a vessel manned by terrorists of Cuban origin from the United States.

18 May 1993. Violation of Cuban airspace by "*Brothers to the Rescue*" aircraft N8447.

21 May 1993. The United States Customs arrested nine terrorists on board a vessel preparing to go to Cuba and attack it. Weapons and explosives were confiscated from them. On 21 August, Justice Lawrence King dismissed the charges against them.

May 1993. "*Brothers to the Rescue*" planned to blow up a high-voltage pylon near San Nicolás de Bari in La Habana province.

October 1993. "*Brothers to the Rescue*" publicly encouraged attempts on the life of President Fidel Castro and violence against Cuba, and confirmed their willingness to accept the "*resulting risks*".

Andrés Nazario Sargén, head of the Alpha 66 terrorist group, announced in the United States that his organization had recently completed five operations against Cuba.

18 October 1993. A terrorist residing in the United States was arrested upon arrival in Cuba; he was planning acts of violence inside Cuba.

7 November 1993. Humberto Pérez, spokesman for Alpha 66 in Miami, announced at a press conference that its war against Cuba would shortly be extended to any tourist visiting the island. He stated "*those who stay in Cuban hotels are considered as enemies*".

1993. A Cuban national was recruited in the United States and visited Cuba for a terrorist organization to carry out sabotage activities in Cuba in the tourism and agriculture sectors. For this action, he was provided with some of the equipment needed and was offered the sum of $20,000.

11 March 1994. A terrorist group from Miami fired shots at the Guitart Cayo Coco Hotel.

17 April 1994. Aircraft owned by "*Brothers to the Rescue*" flew over Havana at low altitude and dropped smoke bombs. In the next few months of 1994, there were at least seven other violations by the same group.

4 September 1994. Infiltration of two terrorists from the United States via the Caibarién district, Villa Clara, with the aim of performing sabotage in that province. Weapons and large amounts of ammunition were confiscated from them.

6 October 1994. Another armed group in a vessel coming from Florida fired automatic weapons against the Guitart Cayo Coco Hotel.

15 October 1994. A group of armed terrorists from the United States landed on the causeway to "*Cayo Santa María*" near Caibarién, Villa Clara, and assassinated comrade Arcelio Rodríguez García.

October 1994. "*Brothers to the Rescue*" used one of its aircraft to train members of a counter-revolutionary organization from Florida to perform sabotage against the Cienfuegos oil refinery.

In November that year, they also planned to make an attempt on the life of President Fidel Castro and other leaders of the Revolution and to smuggle weapons and explosives into the national territory.

November 1994. The terrorist Luis Posada Carriles and five of his accomplices smuggled weapons into Cartagena, Colombia, during the Fourth Ibero-American Summit of Heads of State and Government for an attempt on the life of President Fidel Castro, but the security forces kept them at a distance preventing the attempt. Posada Carriles later informed *The New York Times*: "*I was standing behind some journalists and saw Castro's friend, García Márquez, but I could only see Castro from a distance*".

11 November 1994. Four terrorists were arrested in Varadero, Matanzas, after infiltrating the country. Weapons and ammunition were confiscated from them.

2 March 1995. Infiltration via the coastal region of Puerto Padre, Las Tunas, of two terrorists from the United States, who were carrying 51 pounds of C-4 explosives and other equipment.

4 April 1995. A light C-337 plane violated Cuban airspace north of Havana between Santa Fe and Playa de Guanabo.

20 May 1995. Terrorists on a fast launch originating in the United States launched another attack on the Guitart Cayo Coco Hotel.

12 July 1995. Three terrorists were arrested in the United States as they were getting ready to infiltrate Cuba, taking advantage of a provocative action off the Cuban coast. The United States authorities seized their weapons and explosives, but released them.

13 July 1995. 11 vessels, 6 light planes and 2 helicopters originating in the United States organized by "*Brothers to the Rescue*" entered Cuban territorial waters and airspace. One of the light planes flew over the centre of Havana and dropped propaganda materials.

16 December 1995. Two terrorists, who were planning to infiltrate through Pinar del Rio to carry out subversive actions, were arrested in the United States. The United States authorities seized their weapons and explosives, but released them.

9 January 1996. Two light planes originating in Opa Locka, Florida, violated Cuban airspace.

12 January 1996. A Cuban émigré, resident in the United States, was arrested while preparing to transfer explosives from Havana to Pinar del Rio.

13 January 1996. Several "*Brothers to the Rescue*" planes violated the airspace over Havana. The terrorist, Basulto, later said: "They say that I flew over Cuban territory; everyone knows that and I have never denied it."

23 January 1996. United States authorities intercepted a vessel carrying five armed terrorists in Cayo Maratón; they were heading for Cuba. The FBI released them that same day.

11 February 1996. Cuban border guards seized a vessel with three terrorists on board that had originated in the United States, after shots were fired at the coastline.

24 February 1996. "*Brothers to the Rescue*" launched another foray. Three light planes violated Cuban airspace very close to the centre of Havana; two of them were shot down. In the 20 months preceding that incident there had been at least 25 other violations of Cuban airspace.

26 June 1996. At a meeting of the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the chairman of its commission of inquiry acknowledged that at least two of the "*Brothers to the Rescue*" aircraft in Opa Locka airport still bore markings of the United States Air Force: "the F is a little pale, it looks as if it is beginning to fade, but you can still see it".

21 August 1996. A United States citizen was arrested after smuggling military equipment into the country; he had been planning to carry out terrorist acts on Cuban soil.

16 September 1996. Ciego de Avila was arrested; he had infiltrated via Punta Alegre on a vessel loaded with weapons and a large amount of ammunition.

21 October 1996. A light SS-RR type plane with the registration N3093M belonging to the United States State Department sprayed a substance containing the pest Thrip Palmi Karny while flying over the "Giron" international corridor some 25 to 30 kilometres south of Varadero.

November 1996. Channel 23 in Miami, broadcast a live television interview with Luis Posada Carriles and Orlando Bosch. They said that they intended to continue their terrorist activities against Cuba.

12 April 1997. A bomb exploded in the Melia Cohiba Hotel, in Havana.

30 April 1997. An explosive device was found in the Melia Cohiba Hotel.

12 July 1997. Bombs exploded in the Capri and National hotels.

4 August 1997. Another bomb exploded in the Melia Cohiba Hotel.

11 August 1997. The Miami press published a statement by the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) giving unconditional support to the terrorist bomb attacks on civilian and tourist targets in Cuba. The president of that organization stated: "We do not consider these to be terrorist acts" and added that any action against Cuba was legitimate.

22 August 1997. A bomb exploded in the Sol Palmeras Hotel in Varadero.

4 September 1997. Bombs exploded in the Tritón, Chateau Miramar and Copacabana hotels. The explosion in the latter killed Fabio Di Celmo, a young Italian tourist. That same day, another bomb went off in the El Bodeguita del Medio restaurant.

10 September 1997. The Cuban Government announced the arrest of Raúl Cruz León, a citizen of El Salvador and the person responsible for planting six of the bombs that went off in various hotels in the capital, including the one that killed the Italian tourist, Fabio Di Celmo. Cruz León admitted that he had been paid US$ 4,500 for each bomb.

19 October 1997. An explosive device was found on a tourist minibus.

27 October 1997. The United States Coast Guard stopped a vessel west of Puerto Rico and seized two 50-calibre precision rifles and their tripods, night vision equipment, military uniforms and communications equipment. These sophisticated weapons, strictly military in nature are designed for long-range attacks on vehicles and aircraft. One of the occupants of the launch stated that he planned to assassinate Fidel Castro when the President arrived at Isla Margarita, Venezuela, to attend the Ibero-American Summit on 7 November 1997.

The United States authorities found that the launch was registered to a Florida company. The chief executive officer, director, secretary and treasurer of that company was José Antonio Llama, a CANF official and one of the mercenaries who took part in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

One of the rifles was registered in the name of José Francisco "Pepe" Hernández, president of CANF. The other had been bought in 1994 by a member of Brigade 2506.

The four crew members of the launch were identified as: a known CIA agent; the captain of a CIA boat used by teams infiltrating into Cuba from Florida; the chairman of a New Jersey counter-revolutionary group and a member of Alpha 66.

Despite their own confessions and clear proof of illegal possession of weapons, false testimony and weapons smuggling, these terrorists were acquitted by a Federal Court in December 1999, after a rigged trial.

30 October 1997. An explosive device was discovered in a service kiosk outside terminal 2 at Havana's José Martí airport.

Two citizens of Salvadoran origin and three Guatemalans with ties to the terrorist Luis Posada Carriles were later arrested and charged with criminal activities against tourist facilities.

16 November 1997. Following an investigation that lasted two months, a Florida newspaper reported that the bomb attacks in Havana had been directed and financed by anti-Cuban groups based in Miami and that Luis Posada Carriles, a fugitive from justice for having blown up the Cuban aircraft in 1976, was the man pulling the strings.

May 1998. Infiltration by two terrorists who came from the United States and entered Cuba through Santa Lucía, Pinar del Río, with numerous weapons and munitions.

16 June 1998. Following various exchanges in which the Government of Cuba gave the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and other agencies of the United States Government information on terrorist activities in the United States against Cuba, an official delegation that included two senior FBI officials came to Havana and was provided with specific information, including films, tapes and other material evidence on the activities of 40 terrorists operating from United States territory.

12 July 1998. *The New York Times* of that date reported statements by the Cuban-American Antonio Jorge Álvarez that the FBI had not investigated his reports of a planned attack against President Fidel Castro to be carried out at the Ibero-American Summit in Venezuela. Álvarez said that he had provided information the preceding year to the effect that Posada Carriles and a group that worked in his factory in Guatemala were planning such an attack and the bombings in Havana: "I risked my life and my business, and they did nothing".

12 and 13 July 1998. In an interview with *The New York Times*, Luis Posada Carriles admitted that he had organized the bombing campaign against tourist sites in Cuba, that the leaders of the Cuban American National Foundation had financed his operations and that Jorge Mas Canosa, the Foundation's President, had personally overseen the flow of money and logistical support: "Jorge controlled everything. Whenever I needed money, he said to give me $5,000, give me $10,000, give me $15,000, and they sent it to me". Posada also admitted that he had paid Raúl Cruz León to plant the bombs in Havana hotels. Referring to the Italian tourist killed by one of them, he told the *Times*: "That Italian was sitting in the wrong place at the wrong time". To prepare these articles, the *Times* used Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and FBI files, testimony from more than 100 people and more than 13 hours of taped interviews with Posada, and even documents which he himself had signed.

23 July 1998. The Miami press published an article entitled "Anti-Castro plots seldom lead to jail in U.S.". The article cited a number of cases, such as the 1990 acquittal of six terrorists who had shipped a cannon and other weapons to Nicaragua to attack the Cuban President, and the 1994 cases of Rodolfo Frómeta and Fausto Marimón, who were charged with planning to use Stinger anti-aircraft missiles and other weapons for terrorist activities. The article also included statements by the well-known terrorist Tony Bryant to the effect that, in 1989, the FBI had stopped him with a shipment of weapons and explosives in a boat, but had let him go. He added that two of his 14 missions against Cuba had been intercepted but that nothing had ever happened to him.

2 August 1998. Posada Carriles, in an interview for the programme *Polos Opuestos* on the television channel CBS Telenoticias, said that he intended to perpetrate further attacks against Cuban installations within or outside the island.

August 1998. Following the announcement that President Fidel Castro would attend the Caribbean Forum summit meeting in the Dominican Republic, terrorist elements of Cuban origin planned to carry out an attack between 20 and 25 August. To that end, the terrorist Posada Carriles held a meeting at the Holiday Inn hotel in Guatemala City one month beforehand to plan how to bring weapons and explosives to Santo Domingo.

12 September 1998. Authorities in Miami arrested the five Cuban patriots who had done their duty to defend Cubans and Americans against the terrorist acts organized, prepared and launched against Cuba, with total impunity, from United States territory.

17 November 2000. Panamanian authorities arrested a group of terrorists headed by Posada Carriles, who had entered Panama with false documents to carry out an attack against President Fidel Castro during the tenth Ibero-American Summit of Heads of State and Government. Weapons, explosives and sketches of the Cuban President's route and scheduled public appearances were seized. The Cuban American National Foundation financed the team of lawyers hired to defend the terrorists.

26 April 2001. Three terrorists belonging to the F-45 and Alpha 66 commando groups tried to enter Cuba from the north of Villa Clara province and were captured after they shot at Cuban border guards who detected them. Authorities seized four AKM rifles, one M-3 gun with a silencer, three handguns, a large supply of ammunition, night-vision weapon sights and means of communication, which were to be used to carry out acts of sabotage and terrorism in Cuba.

In addition to the above-mentioned acts, the Cuban authorities have learned of 16 planned attacks against the President of Cuba, eight planned attacks against other leaders of the Revolution and 140 other terrorist plans between 1990 and 2001, which were thwarted, discouraged or blocked by the work of Cuba's security and intelligence agencies.

United Nations S/2001/1039

Security Council

Distr.: General
2 November 2001
English
Original: Spanish

Letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a background paper on an important case of terrorist activity against Cuba (see annex). The authorities of my country have been following the developments in this case very closely.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Bruno **Rodríguez Parrilla**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-61822 (E) 051101 051101

Annex to the letter dated 26 October 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

As is well known, on 17 November 2000, a planned attack against President Fidel Castro was thwarted in Panama as a result of information received from Cuba. The plan was organized by the Miami-based Cuban American National Foundation through the notorious international terrorist Posada Carriles, who is currently in custody in Panama.

Posada Carriles was responsible for the in-flight explosion, in 1976, of a Cubana de Aviación passenger aircraft in Barbados, which resulted in the death of 73 people. He is also responsible for terrorist acts against 28 countries.

Also being held in Panama are Pedro Remón Rodríguez, a Miami resident with a long history of terrorism, who murdered an official of the Cuban Mission to the United Nations; Guillermo Novo Sampoll, a United States resident and one of the leaders of Omega 7, who fired a bazooka at the United Nations in 1964 and was involved in the assassination of Chilean Minister for Foreign Affairs Orlando Letelier in 1976; and Miami resident Gaspar Jiménez Escobedo, a chief liaison with the Cuban American National Foundation who participated in the murder of a Cuban official in Mexico, and who was arrested in 1977 for violating the United States Neutrality Act through his terrorist acts against Cuba. He attempted to assassinate the Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations in 1980, and he has been involved in many plans to attack the Cuban President.

Authorities seized 20 kilograms of C-4 and 50 packages of Semtex, maps of the auditorium at the University of Panama and other evidence that the suspects were preparing to blow up the auditorium during an appearance by President Fidel Castro before thousands of students. They might also have attacked other events in connection with the Ibero-American Summit, seriously endangering the lives of the other Presidents.

Posada Carriles was trained by the CIA and worked as a CIA officer to unify the most aggressive anti-Cuban mercenary groups. After the explosion of the aircraft in Barbados, he was allowed to escape from the Venezuelan prison to which he had been sentenced and reappeared, collecting salaries from the CIA and the State Department, as one of the leaders of the "Contragate" scheme under the direction of Oliver North. He later worked for two Central American Presidents, concocted dozens of terrorist acts against Cuba and attempted to assassinate President Fidel Castro at the Ibero-American Summit in Cartagena and during the President's visits to the Dominican Republic and Venezuela.

Posada Carriles went to the United States several times, and freely visited Miami in 1996. In 1997, he organized the hotel bombing campaign in Havana and, from El Salvador, gave interviews to *The New York Times* and the Miami-based television channel *Telenoticias*.

In June 1998, *The New York Times* published information amply demonstrating that the Cuban American National Foundation had financed the hotel bombing campaign in Havana through Cuban-American New Jersey resident Chávez Abarca, using Posada Carriles and Central American mercenaries, some of whom were arrested and penalized in Cuba.

The Cuban authorities initiated a request for the extradition of Posada Carriles and the other terrorists on 18 November, made a formal request on 29 November and, on 15 January, complied with the request of the Panamanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to provide further information for the extradition case file within the prescribed time limit.

Our country gave full guarantees that the terrorists would receive due process and that they would not be sentenced to death or to more than 20 years' imprisonment, and proposed that they should be tried by a Latin American international tribunal in Havana. Cuba's extradition request meets all the relevant requirements and is in full compliance with the Bustamante Code and the Panamanian Constitution and Penal Code.

The United States Government has exerted great pressure on Panama to prevent the terrorist group's extradition. This is not surprising, because successive United States Administrations have organized, financed and carried out many terrorist acts against Cuba over the past few decades, using mercenaries such as these; because the United States policy of aggression, subversion and economic warfare against Cuba directly encourages terrorism against our country; and because the United States knowingly allows the Cuban American National Foundation and other terrorist organizations that continually finance, organize, provide means for and carry out terrorist acts against Cuba to exist and operate openly and with impunity in United States territory.

On 14 May 2001, the Government of Panama formally denied Cuba's extradition request. The Cuban authorities stated their position in this regard in an official note delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Panama on 30 May by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Cuba.

Cuba does not seek vengeance, but only a fair trial and severe punishment for a group of terrorists who, for more than three decades, have committed countless crimes against our people.